DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 698 HE 008 754

AUTHOR Ciampa, Bartholomew J.
TITLE Comparative Faculty Provinciality: An Assessment Model.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 20p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; *College Faculty; College Planning; Comparative Analysis; *Degrees (Titles); *Faculty Mobility; Faculty Recruitment; *Geographic Distribution; Models; *Occupational Mobility; Research; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Provinciality

ABSTRACT

Faculty provinciality (defined as the extent to which an institution's faculty members are graduates of that or nearby institutions) is an area of higher education research that remains relatively unexplored but is becoming increasingly significant as institutions of higher learning strive for maintenance of academic standards through personnel actions. Comparative institutional provinciality studies should be considered when faculty recruitment, faculty effectiveness, and curricular changes are considered on a departmental, divisional, or institution-wide basis. This assessment model identifies the implications of geographic provinciality on the training of college-level faculty and the resultant staffing patterns at employing institutions. (Author/MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136698

Comparative Faculty Provinciality:

An Assessment Model

by

Bartholomew J. Ciampa, Ph.D.
Director of Teacher Training and
Associate Professor of Education
Nasson College, Springvale, Maine

HE008754

Abstract

Faculty provinciality is an area of higher education research which remains relatively unexplored but is becoming increasingly significant as institutions of higher learning strive for maintenance of academic standards through personnel actions.

Comparative institutional provinciality studies should be considered when faculty recruitment, faculty effectiveness, and curricular changes are considered on either departmental, divisional, or institution-wide basis.

This assessment model identifies the implications of geographic provinciality upon the training of college-level faculty and the resultant staffing patterns at employing institutions.

Introduction

At what point is a university's (or component of that university's) faculty considered academically provincial? Is it desireable to have alumni comprise a certain proportion of an institution's faculty? If so, what percentage and at which level (bachelors, masters, doctoral)? Is geographic diversity of academic preparation a desireable faculty trait?

When one reads a university's faculty register which includes attained degrees and the institution from which the respective degrees were granted, it is sometimes striking to note the high number of faculty members who have been granted one or more degrees by the institution at which they are now employed. Upon closer examination it is sometimes observed that a large proportion of the remaining faculty (degrees) were awarded from other institutions within the same state or from those located in bordering states.

Are some publicly-supported institutions more provincial (in this respect) than others within the same state? Are some state systems of public higher education more provincial than others? Are there significant differences between publicly-supported and private institutions?

The following study attempts to find answers to provinciality-related questions. Further, it is hoped that the implications of geographic provinciality upon the training of college level faculty and the resultant staffing patterns at employing institutions will be identified.

Review of Related Literature

There seem to be no prior studies available which deal with the questions at hand on either an inter-institution, public vs. private institution, or state-by-state basis.

A number of studies exist which treat teacher mobility in light of changing supply and demand but these studies focus primarily on elementary and secondary levels.

For example, Pederson's[1] study was designed to generate a research format and an index capable of the analysis of substantial data about the turnover behavior of teachers from Michigan school districts. It also set out to acquire further understandings about the concomitants of teacher migration.

Other school district-oriented studies such as Henley's[2] deal with the academic preparation of specific subject area secondary teachers without really ever addressing the question of provinciality.

A number of recent community-college level studies assessed academic backgrounds and personal characteristics of faculty members on both regional[3] and subject-area specialization[4] bases. Ann Davenport's unpublished master's thesis[5] came very close to dealing with the provinciality question and stated in her findings that 62% of all sociology instructors in junior colleges of the South received their entire college background in the South. Again, however, her study was subject-area based and also dealt rather generally with a broad region of the United States as opposed to an institution-by-institution or state-by-state analysis.

Medical school faculty characteristics also seem to be well scrutinized as in "Profiles of U.S. Medical School Faculties".[6] This study presents a series of national profiles of salaried medical school faculties and covers demographic characteristics, major areas of professional activity, and sources of recruitment, among others. Medical school faculty mobility analyses are found quite frequently as in Anderson's and Larson's 1975 study.[7]

Senior college level studies on an intra-institutional basis are quite common as offices of institutional research are continually compiling faculty data regarding sex, age, institution from which highest degree was attained, level of highest degree, etc., but these characteristics are generally of a purely descriptive nature.[8]

Rarely have researchers even remotely courted the notion of comparative institutional provinciality. One such case, however, entitled "The Higher Education Faculty of Pennsylvania: Selected Characteristics" actually went so far as to state that less then 20% of faculty on Commonwealth campuses have returned to their alma maters as teachers.[9] Again, purely descriptive data with no inter-institutional or public vs. private comparison is presented.

The foregoing citations represent examples of studies in the order of their proximity to answering the questions being dealt with in this study. A review of the literature revealed that no prior study has been undertaken which deals precisely with those questions of comparative institutional provinciality previously stated. Consequently, this study

might very well serve as an introduction to further research which, through modification, will provide a broad data base from which statistical inferences can be drawn. As such, comparative institutional provinciality ratings might be considered when faculty recruitment, faculty effectiveness, and curricular changes are considered on either a departmental, divisional, or institution-wide basis.

Data Gathering and Statistical Procedures

In order to facilitate the data gathering for the initial phase of this study it was decided to focus on the State of Maine's relatively compact system of higher education. The most recent college catalog or faculty register was obtained from senior-level, general purpose, public and private Maine colleges.[10] Full-time ranked faculty were catagorized by bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels according to 1) Degrees awarded from the employing institution; 2) Degrees awarded from other institutions within the same state; 3) Degrees awarded from institutions located within other New England states; and 4) Degrees awarded from institutions located in all other states or countries.

Pearson correlations and t-tests were performed comparing all publicly supported institutions with one-another, all private institutions with one-another, public institutional totals with private institutional totals, in addition to composite public and composite private correlations.

All null hypotheses were rejected at the .05 level of statistical significance.

The major limitation of the study arises as a result of considering only attained degrees. This practice precludes the consideration of such provinciality dispelling contingencies as non-degree graduate study, extensive travel, and prior teaching location. However, since this liability appears to be distributed over all institutions without regard to public or private nature, its influence is negligible except when an institution with a high proportion of terminal degrees is compared to an institution with a low proportion of terminal degrees. For in that case, faculty quality predicated upon high proportions of attained terminal degrees would ordinarily be considered superior regardless of provinciality levels.

Findings

1. a) 266 degrees held by 1175 public institution faculty members were awarded by the employing institution (140 undergraduate and 126 graduate).

   b) 9.4% of all degrees held by public institution faculty members were awarded by the employing institution (11.9% undergraduate and 7.6% graduate).

   c) 55 degrees held by 531 private institution faculty members were awarded by the employing institution (55 undergraduate and 0 graduate).

   d) 4.2% of all degrees held by private institution faculty members were awarded by the employing institution (10.1% undergraduate and 0.0% graduate).

2. a) 263 degrees held by 1175 public institution faculty members were awarded by other institutions within the same state (150 undergraduate and 113 graduate).

   b) 9.3% of all degrees held by public institution faculty members were awarded by other institutions within the same state (12.7% undergraduate and 6.8% graduate).

   c) 80 degrees held by 531 private institution faculty members were awarded by other institutions within the same state (47 undergraduate and 33 graduate).

   d) 6.1% of all degrees held by private institution faculty members were awarded by other institutions within the same state (8.6% undergraduate and 4.3% graduate).

3. a) 519 degrees held by 1175 public institution faculty members were awarded by institutions located within another New England state (222 undergraduate and 297 graduate).

b) 18.3% of all degrees held by public institution faculty members were awarded by institutions located within another New England state (18.9% undergraduate and 17.8% graduate).

c) 409 degrees held by 531 private institution faculty members were awarded by institutions located within another New England state (145 undergraduate and 264 graduate).

d) 31.2% of all degrees held by private institution faculty members were awarded by institutions located within another New England state (26.6% undergraduate and 34.5% graduate).

4. a) 1794 degrees held by 1175 public institution faculty members were awarded by institutions located outside New England (665 undergraduate and 1129 graduate).

b) 63.1% of all degrees held by public institution faculty members were awarded by institutions located outside New England (56.5% undergraduate and 67.8% graduate).

c) 767 degrees held by 531 private institution faculty members were awarded by institutions located outside New England (299 undergraduate and 468 graduate).

d) 58.5% of all degrees held by private institution faculty members were awarded by institutions located outside New England (54.8% undergraduate and 61.2% graduate).

5. a) 57% of public institution faculty members and 62% of private institution faculty members hold the earned doctorate.

   b) There is a very high correlation ($r = 0.94$) between public institution faculty degree characteristics and private institution faculty degree characteristics (totals).

   c) However, a significant chi square ($X^2 = 30.06$) is obtained when public institution faculty characteristics are compared to private institution faculty characteristics (on a proportional basis with averages as expected cell data). This appears to indicate that item analyses are warranted.

Conclusions

On the basis of the proportion of degrees held by public and private institution faculty members which were awarded by institutions located outside New England, it appears that neither public nor private institution faculties as a whole are particularly provincial.

Public and private institution faculty members also compare favorably when the proportion of earned doctorates and the correlation of degree characteristics are considered.

It should be noted, however, that a) it is far more likely for a public institution faculty member to have received a degree from the employing institution; and b) it is far more likely for a public institution faculty member to have received a degree from an institution located within the same state.

Since no graduate programs exist at any of the private institutions within the state, all graduate degrees found in the catagory entitled "awarded from an institution located within the same state" were awarded from public institutions. It follows that 100% of all graduate degrees in this catagory held by public institution faculty members were awarded by a publicly-supported institution.

Further, since 0.0% of all graduate degrees in this catagory held by private institution faculty members were awarded by a privately-supported institution, it follows that in this particular catagory a more diverse mode of graduate training exists among private institution faculty members.

Conclusions (cont'd)

Preliminary data gathered from other states suggest that a high degree of provinciality exists within certain publicly-supported institutions, privately-supported institutions, and entire state-wide systems of public higher education.

Because of increasing demands for program accountability in both fiscal and curricular directions, institutional researchers should begin to conduct provinciality studies to be used as planning tools to ensure proper levels of faculty heterogeneity. For, institutional provinciality should be one of the factors considered when personnel decisions are made on either departmental, divisional, or institution-wide levels.

References

[1]K. George Penderson, "The Itinerant Schoolmaster. A Socio-economic Analysis of Teacher Turnover" (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center - University of Chicago, 1973.)

[2]David C. Henley, "A Survey of Educational and Professional Backgrounds of Journalism Teachers in California Public High Schools With Enrollments of 1000 or More" (San Diego, California: paper presented to Assoc. for Education in Journalism, 1974.)

[3]James L. Brown, "Backgrounds and Characteristics of New Full-Time Community College Faculty Members" (Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Clearinghouses, Research In Education, February, 1976.)

[4]Raymond J. Garrity, "A Study of Science Instructors in the Junior and Community Colleges" (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1972.)

[5]Ann Davenport, "A Profile of Instructors of Sociology in Junior Colleges of the South" (Lubbock, Texas: Texas Tech. University, unpublished master's thesis, 1971.)

[6]"Profiles of U.S. Medical School Faculties" (Bethesda, Maryland: National Institute of Health, Resources Analysis Branch, October, 1972.)

[7]Philip Anderson and Thomas Larson, "A Preliminary Analysis of Differential Characteristics Between High and Low Mobile Medical School Faculties" (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Medical Colleges, 1975.)

[8]"Selected Characteristics of Full-Time Faculty" (Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia, Office of Institutional Analysis, June, 1973.)

[9]Larry L. Leslie and James Creasy, "The Higher Education Faculty of Pennsylvania: Selected Characteristics" (University Park, Pennsylvania: Center for the Study of Higher Education, July, 1974.)

[10]Excluding Ricker College and Unity College because of non-conforming mode of reporting faculty characteristics.

TABLE 1. Public Institutions

College	Degree Awarded from same Institution			Awarded from an Institution located w/in same State			Awarded from an Institution located w/in New England St.			All Others			Totals				Total
NAME	Bach.	Mas.	Doc.	Bach.	Mas.	Doc.	Bach.	Mas.	Doc.	Bach.	Mas.	Doc.	Bach.	Mas.	Doc.		Faculty
A	13	4	0	25	25	1	18	18	6	40	45	32	96	92	39	(41%)	96
(UMF)																	
B	1	0	0	16	14	2	8	5	1	19	16	11	44	35	14	(31%)	45
(UMM)																	
C	111	97	21	26	4	0	99	79	57	435	356	360	671	536	438	(66%)	661
(UMO)																	
D	1	0	0	12	11	3	15	13	5	35	35	21	63	59	29	(48%)	61
(UMPI)																	
E	0	0	0	6	7	1	5	6	1	14	12	8	25	25	10	(40%)	25
(UMFK)																	
I	14	4	0	65	34	11	77	67	39	122	140	93	278	245	143	(50%)	287
(UMPG)																	
Totals	140	105	21	150	95	18	222	188	109	665	604	525	1177	992	673	(57%)	1175

TABLE 2. Private Colleges

College	Degree Awarded from same Institution			Awarded from Inst. located w/in same St.			Awarded from an Institution located w/in New England St.			All Others			Totals				Total
NAME	Bach.	Mas.	Doc.	Bach.	Mas.	Doc.	Bach.	Mas.	Doc.	Bach.	Mas.	Doc.	Bach.	Mas.	Doc.		Faculty
A[1]	12	0	0	6	3	0	31	34	21	70	54	56	119	91	77	(66%)	117
(Bates)																	
B[1]	15	0	0	4	0	1	32	37	32	78	50	53	129	87	86	(72%)	119
(Bowdoin)																	
C[1]	10	0	0	9	2	1	40	33	27	87	85	70	146	120	98	(69%)	143
(Colby)																	
D[1]	0	0	0	5	2	0	22	19	15	28	25	18	55	46	33	(60%)	55
(Nasson)																	
E[1]	4	0	0	5	3	1	9	8	5	17	23	10	35	34	16	(46%)	35
(St.Francis)																	
F[1]	13	0	0	2	6	1	7	16	5	9	11	7	31	33	13	(42%)	31
(St.Joseph's)																	
G[1]	1	0	0	16	13	0	4	9	3	10	3	3	31	25	6	(19%)	31
(Thomas)																	
Totals	55	0	0	47	29	4	145	156	108	299	251	217	546	436	329	(62%)	531

TABLE 3. Correlation Matrices

Public Colleges	A	B	C	D	E	F
A		.91	.78	.94	.95	.92
B	.91		.58*	.85	.92	.81
C	.78	.58*		.85	.77	.81
D	.94	.85	.85		.97	.97
E	.95	.92	.77	.97		.93
F	.92	.81	.81	.97	.93	

*Significant at 0.05 level

Private Colleges	A^1	B^1	C^1	D^1	E^1	F^1	G^1
A^1		.99	.98	.92	.89	.58*	.13*
B^1	.99		.96	.93	.85	.58*	.11*
C^1	.98	.96		.92	.94	.51*	.09*
D^1	.92	.93	.92		.87	.55*	.19*
E^1	.89	.85	.94	.87		.57*	.18*
F^1	.58*	.58*	.51*	.55*	.57*		.18*
G^1	.13*	.11*	.09*	.19*	.18*	.18*	

*Significant at 0.05 level

TABLE 4. t-Test Matrices

Public Colleges	A	B	G	D	E	F
A		1.87	2.90*	.65	2.36*	3.02*
B	1.87		3.16*	1.78	.40	4.00*
C	2.90*	3.16*		2.48*	2.52*	1.58*
D	.65	1.78	2.48*		1.36	3.54*
E	2.36*	.40	2.52*	1.36		4.24*
F	3.02*	4.00*	1.58	3.54	4.24	

*Significant at .05 level

Private Colleges	A^1	B^1	C^1	D^1	E^1	F^1	G^1
A^1		.88	1.00	.77	1.89	2.02	2.00
B^1	.88		.89	.87	1.96	2.09	2.06
C^1	1.00	.89		1.11	2.03	2.12	2.07
D^1	.77	.87	1.11		.67	.92	1.07
E^1	1.89	1.96	2.03	.67		.24	.07
F^1	2.02	2.09	2.12	.92	.24		.20
G^1	2.00	2.06	2.07	1.07	.07	.20	

(none significant at .05 level)